DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 022 388 FL 000 835

By-Brooks, Nelson

TEACHING CULTURE IN THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM.

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, New York, N.Y.

Spons Agency-Modern Language Association, New York, N.Y. ERIC Clearinghouse on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Pub Date Mar 65

Note-14p.

Journal Cit-Foreign Language Annals; v1 n3 p204-17 Mar 1968

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.64

Descriptors-AUDIOVISUAL AIDS, *CLASSROOM TECHNIQUES, CULTURAL AWARENESS, *CULTURAL CONTEXT, *EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES, *FOREIGN CULTURE, *LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION, LITERATURE, RESEARCH, SOCIOCULTURAL PATTERNS, SURVEYS

An attempt is made to define and describe culture for foreign language teachers, particularly those involved in the earlier phases of instruction. Reasons advanced for the inclusion of culture in language study center around the light it sheds on the real meanings of the target language. Projects, activities, and reports on culture in the language field are briefly reviewed. Negative and positive definition of culture are offered, distinctions are made between formal and deep culture, and an anthropologist's list of cultural focal points is outlined and expanded. Also discussed is the changing presentation of cultural content in the language classroom as the student advances. Proposals are made for the sharpening of these cultural definitions and for the preparation of pertinent materials. A brief bibliography is included. (AF)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Teaching Culture in the Foreign Language Classroom

AN ERIC REPORT
MLA/ERIC Clearinghouse on the Teaching of Foreign Languages

Reprinted from
Foreign Language Annals
Volume I, Number 3 (March 1968)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Foreign Language Annals

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Nelson Brooks

ABSTRACT: There is general agreement that culture should be taught in a language course, but just what this means is unclear. The scientists propose a concept of totality quite unlike the idea of perfection entertained by humanistic scholars. Attempts to accommodate the two points of view have so far met with limited success. To rough out a definition of culture that will be immediately useful to language teachers, statements are made as to what culture is *not*, viz.: geography, history, folklore, sociology, literature, civilization. Five meanings of culture are identified: growth, refinement, fine arts, patterns of living, and a total way of life. The fourth meaning refers to the role of the individual in life situations of every kind and his conformity to the rules and models for attitude and conduct in them. This meaning is seen as the most immediately useful in instruction. The third and fifth meanings gain in importance as language competence develops. A dual interpretation of culture is recommended, both scientific and humanistic, and an outline for each is suggested. A number of ways of applying these recommendations in classroom procedure are set forth. A list of proposals invites discussion and development of these ideas leading to wide professional acceptance.

ED022388
FL 000 835

Foreword

THE PURPOSE of this paper is to define and describe culture in terms that will be meaningful to classroom teachers of foreign languages, especially in the earlier phases of instruction. No attempt is made to portray culture for the literary scholar nor for the scientist in psychology or linguistics or anthropology. In each of these disciplines the concept must be developed according to the needs and insights of those immediately concerned. Whether or not the concept presented here is fully satisfactory to those who practice these disciplines is irrelevant. We have reached a point at which foreign language teachers must themselves decide what is to be understood by and done about culture as it relates to their professional responsibilities.

There is, at the same time, no intention of showing for these adjacent fields any less respect than in the past, or anything other than appreciation and approval of their aims and accomplishments. This is especially true of literature. The ideas and proposals set forth here are offered in full confidence that the goals now being pursued in language classes will continue to result in the presence of more and better prepared students in literature courses.

In learning a foreign language the words themselves count less than what they mean. The meaning of a word is, at bottom, the segment of personal or societal life to which it refers. The intent of this paper is to find ways of studying how language is linked to the way of life of which it is so significant a part, as well as ways of appreciating the attitudes and values of users of language that bind them so firmly to the culture in which they were nurtured.

NELSON BROOKS (Ph.D., Yale University) is Associate Professor of French at Yale, Director of Summer Programs, and Director of the Summer Language Institute. He has taught French at school and college levels for the past forty years. Since 1957 he has been conducting courses in the Yale Graduate School for future teachers of foreign languages. He is the author of several language tests, of the book *Language and Language Learning*, and of numerous articles on pedagogical subjects. Since 1958 he has served from time to time as consultant to the language program of the U.S. Office of Education. From 1960 to 1964 he served as a member of the Board of Education in New Haven, Connecticut. He was director of the project that produced the *MLA Cooperative Foreign Language Tests*. In 1966 he published a brochure on teaching culture in the language class. Perhaps the most important philosopher on foreign language teaching of the present generation, he created the term *audiolingual* and pioneered many of the related concepts.

The Problem

Our greatest immediate problem is that we are uncertain about what we mean by the word *culture*. For decades our profession has announced its intention of teaching culture. Teachers want to teach culture. Many have done so and continue to do so, with results that are more or less satisfactory. There has been a cultural dimension discernible in textbook materials for a long time. Its form has varied from the inclusion of a few footnotes to the preparation of an entire approach entitled "cultural" and incorporating culture as a principal factor.

Yet the need remains for a definition of culture that is widely agreed upon and is meaningful in terms of events in a language classroom. Well-intended phrases that relate cultural studies to the desire for peace and friendship among nations need to be amplified with specific detail. The classroom teacher is entitled to say: "Better international understanding is a noble aim and I am for it. But what should I be doing at nine-fifteen on a Tuesday morning in my language class that will help bring it about?"

It appears that a suitable concept of culture needs first of all to be made explicit. It should then be communicated to those who prepare materials for classroom teaching and be reflected in plans, selections, exercises, and recommendations. It should also be communicated to those who teach and those who are preparing to teach so that they may know what is meant by the term *culture* as they deal with language learning and with examples of literature. The concept should be set forth in such a way that it may be grasped by students as well as teachers, first of all to understand what it is, then to see how the insight applies to those whose language is being learned.

The needed concept of culture should be expressed in terms that will be usable by those who teach and learn in schools as well as in colleges. It is during the early phases of language instruction that the inclusion of culture is at once the most significant and the most baffling. As every year passes an increasing number of students have their first encounter with another language in the schools, while colleges deal less with monolinguals and more with the advanced phases of language study and with literature. We are approaching a time when the teaching of the beginning phases will, in college, be principally for those who are already competent in a language other than their mother tongue.

Cultural anthropologists are by now reasonably clear as to what they mean by the word *culture*, at least in their discipline. What the word means to the humanistic scholar, however, still remains diffuse and ill-defined. While anthropologists have a deep respect for language competence and recognize in language a most important component of culture as they conceive of it, they are motivated by no strong desire to influence the teaching of foreign languages one way or another. In this their outlook differs notably from that of humanistic scholars, many of whom feel that in the academic world language studies should be illuminated by and oriented toward one field only: literature. At the same time the linguistic scientist often takes the position that whatever is said or done about language, even language learning, should bear his stamp of approval. These varying winds of doctrine and cross currents of opinion and research make heavy going for classroom teachers. They are entitled to feel that their understanding of the problem should be clearly expressed.

Need for solution

The desire for a cultural accompaniment to language acquisition has long been felt though only vaguely understood by the great majority of language teachers. There is little need to exhort them to teach culture; their willingness is already manifest. But there is a need to help them understand what meaning they should assign to the word *culture* and how it can become significant and fruitful in a sequence of years of language study. There is a need for materials especially prepared for the teaching of culture and for tests that will measure the learner's progress in acquiring information and sensitivity in this area.

But it may well be asked whether the need for a more precise definition of culture is so widely justified after all. Is this really a central issue in providing students with control of a

foreign language, which is, at bottom, the teacher's essential task? Is anything more than incidental encounter with and random reference to cultural matters required in establishing the language skills? Will special emphasis upon culture not be wasteful of precious class time and end by giving the student less rather than more of what he is entitled to expect from his language course? Should not the language class concern itself with language proper and postpone cultural matters until the student has greater maturity and greater language competence? There are already available many texts with a cultural ingredient in their total content; is it really necessary to do more than is already being done?

An immediate answer is that the proper time for the beginning of cultural understanding is important. Because of the large decrease in population in language classes with each succeeding year of advancement, the concept of culture can be communicated to only a relatively small number of students unless this is done in the earliest phases of their instruction. As the analysis of language in both its externalized and internalized forms is carried forward, it becomes increasingly clear that we have not taught even the beginnings of a foreign language unless we have taught what it means to those whose native language it is. The mere recording in new linguistic forms of one's native culture hardly justifies the effort involved in becoming adept at all the rules and practices of another language. But we cannot know what the new language means to the native speaker until we know in some systematic and fairly extensive way the meaning he attaches to the words and phrases he uses.

When the learner puts his newly acquired language to use he soon finds that there are overtones of meaning that are not captured by skills, grammar, or lexicon. If a student speaks to a teacher and uses forms of pronoun, verb, and possessive adjective that are in the second person singular, he will have committed a serious error that is either laughable or impertinent. But it is an error that nothing in pronunciation, grammar, or vocabulary can help him correct or avoid. Such a mistake is related not to any theory of language but to a theory of language users. This, of course, moves the problem out of linguistics as such and into culture. This amounts to saying that instruction in a foreign language, even at the start, remains inaccurate and incomplete unless it is complemented by appropriate studies in culture.

The study of culture in the foreign language classroom appears to be a matter of greater importance than we have hitherto supposed, due to the nature of language and to the circumstances encountered in learning a second language in formal education. This importance is intensified if we look closely at the full range of language as a means of communication.

In theoretical terms, we may analyze language in action into three distinct bands: syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic. By *syntactic* we refer to the grammar of sounds, marks, forms, and orders of words, and their relationship to each other. It has been succinctly defined by Charles Morris as the relationship of signs to signs. The *semantic* area is immediately adjacent to the syntactic. Here we study how signs mean what they mean and how the modifications in the syntactic area bring about parallel modifications in meaning. This has been defined by Morris as the relation of signs to things signified. In the third area, the *pragmatic*, we may study the manipulation of syntax and semantics by an actual user of language. A new element is now introduced, for language at this point acquires a unique coloring and bias depending upon what the individual brings to the language act in terms of his age, status, attitude, intent, and similar factors. A spoken interview or a personal letter will tell us something about both the writer and his language that is not to be discovered by searching out in the dictionary the words he has employed or in a grammar the constructions he has used.

There are two principal ingredients in the individual's contribution to language in action. One is biological, having its origin in the genetic heritage of the speaker; the other is social, having its origin in the beliefs, habits, and practices of those with whom the individual comes in contact. These result in the cultural dimension of language, without which it remains, in an important way, wanting.

There are other less radical yet equally valid reasons for the systematic pursuit of cultural

studies throughout the language course. An incessant problem in all classroom work is the involvement of the student's interest, attention, and active participation. A prime source of these motivating factors is the student's awareness of his own growth in mastering a new mode of symbolic expression. This source of motivation is especially powerful at the start of the language course, and often provides, in itself, sufficient forward thrust to keep the learner working at a productive rate for a long time. Another source of motivation, different in nature, but equally forceful, is the satisfying of an eager curiosity about what life is like in other places, in other climates, in other times. Information as to what it is like to be a member of another societal group is again precisely what is meant by a systematic study of culture. A third source of motivation is the pleasure to be derived from the writings of talented authors whose works, either literary or expository, have an esthetic attractiveness and a humanistic appeal to which the young are sensitive, often to a remarkable degree, provided the manner of presentation is of the appropriate sort.

Up to now

References that can be termed cultural are of course to be discovered in almost any activities of language teachers and in any materials printed for student use. But up to now there have not been very many serious attempts to deal with the subject of culture in language instruction at a professional level and in a systematic way.

It may be useful to classify what has been done in the following manner:

a) Individual authorship
b) Research projects
c) Teacher training and retraining programs
d) College courses
e) Standard tests
f) Conferences and seminars supported by professional groups and followed by the distribution of printed reports

At the level of individual authorship we find culture included, sometimes incidentally, sometimes in a purposeful and sustained way in many language texts and reading texts. In addition, not a few books have been published with the unique intent of portraying the culture of a given foreign country. A number of colleges and universities have offered courses for students who are already quite competent in language and who wish to pursue studies that are not exclusively literary in nature but in which literature is one of many facets of the target culture that are the subject matter of the course.

A landmark in professional attention to the role of culture in language instruction was the seminar held in the summer of 1953 at the University of Michigan. This seminar was supported by the Modern Language Association and resulted from a proposal presented to the Association by Albert Marckwardt in December 1952. The subject of the seminar was: "Developing Cultural Understanding through Foreign Language Study." The participants were: R. W. Brown, J. E. Englekirk, D. H. French, M. C. Johnston, V. H. W. Lange, A. H. Marckwardt, R. L. Politzer, A. Sommerfelt, and B. W. Wheeler. Present also as junior assistants were L. R. Criminale and J. A. Davies. There were daily sessions during the four weeks from 29 June to 24 July. French, German, and Spanish, in addition to English, were selected as the languages to be represented. A twenty-three page summary report of discussions, findings, and recommendations appeared in *PMLA* in December 1953.

The seminar was interdisciplinary, based upon the realization that only thus could the subject be properly dealt with. Most of the problems we now face were foreseen at that time and many excellent recommendations were offered. There was, however, little immediate effect of the publication of this report. For lack of funds, for lack of organizational facilities and personnel, perhaps most of all for lack of professional readiness for the problem in the terms in which it was presented, no widely based changes of significance came about as a result of this seminar.

A few years later, in the spring of 1960, the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages selected as the topic for its yearly discussions and reports: "Culture in Language Learning." Several committees considered and wrote about aspects of this matter and, as is customary, their formal reports were

printed and distributed widely in the area served by this conference. The views of both scientists and humanists are expressed in these reports, which are characterized by rather unsuccessful efforts to synthesize in a way useful to classroom teachers a number of points of view that differed widely in content, perspective, and basic analysis.

Under the auspices of the NDEA, a research project for the examination of cross-cultural contrasts comparing the United States with a number of European countries was launched in 1959. Though classroom pedagogy was not the immediate concern of this research, the ultimate use of its findings in the preparation of teaching materials and in the training of teachers as well as upon classroom programs was envisaged from the start.

Other research projects linking cultural studies to language instruction have also been supported by NDEA funds, notably the project under the direction of Howard Nostrand at the University of Washington.

Culture has played an important role in two other types of activity. One is the inclusion of a section on Culture and Civilization in the battery of seven tests that comprise the *MLA Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students*. The other is the inclusion of culture as a major topic in the programs of the NDEA Institutes, both summer and academic year, presented on a long list of college and university campuses in each successive year beginning in 1959.

From a review of these projects, activities, and reports, two conclusions stand out in sharp clarity: there is an imperative need for a definition of culture in all its meanings. Even greater is the need for a synthesis of culture as viewed by the scientist on the one hand and by the humanist on the other into an orderly and coherent program that can be meaningful in terms of the daily happenings in language classes at the earlier stages of instruction.

Clarification of concepts

Since a precise statement of what culture is in terms of classroom instruction will obviously be difficult, a degree of clarification may result from making some remarks about what culture is *not*. If they seem exaggerated, the overstatement is a consequence of the fog of confusion that now surrounds us. We shall make rough approximations knowing that they will inevitably need modification and refinement.

Culture is not the same as geography. The latter is a study of the surface of the earth, of its land and water areas, its temperature and climate, its mineral deposits and sources of power and fuel, its plant and animal life, and its characteristics that are favorable or unfavorable to human life. Though the study of geography began with the Greeks, geography itself is as old as the earth, and thus far older than the human culture which is our present concern. Geography is the stage upon which the drama of human culture is played. But the play's the thing, not the scenery. Geography can at best be no more than the material surroundings in which culture takes root, flourishes, and comes to fruition.

Culture is not the same as history. Of course everything has a history—even history—and human culture is no exception. But our reference is to the discipline of history, whose purpose is to tell the story of the past. It does this with the most careful reference to existing documents, these being almost exclusively in the form of written records. There is some recognition of monuments, buildings, and artifacts, but in the main history is a matter of printed and written documents. The historian establishes with the greatest care the authenticity of prime sources, then collates, sifts, selects, interprets, and evaluates in terms of a coherent and meaningful pattern. Events that occurred before there were written records are called pre-history, which incorporates, to no little extent, conjecture and deduction. In general, it is fair to say that history goes back no further than the invention of writing, an event of the fifth century B.C. Though much younger than geography, human culture is vastly older than history, for culture appears at present to go back in time the greater part of two million years.

Culture is not the same as folklore, the systematically studied customs, legends, and superstitions that are transmitted in an informal way from one generation to another by means of oral communication. Tales of heroes, songs, dances, home remedies, childhood games

and pastimes all loom large in folklore. These matters are important in that they are a part of the common experience of the young and serve to establish a sentimental bond among the members of a cultural group who have shared them in early life. At times they may serve to reflect national aspirations, attitudes, and values. There is no doubt of the worth of folkways as colorful and characteristic expressions of a societal group, and they can be very useful in the understanding of primitive societies. But folklore can provide only a limited and partial view of what we mean by culture.

Culture is not the same as sociology, a discipline that dates from the early nineteenth century. Sociology is the science of human groups, viewed essentially in their collective aspects. Usually noted are the family, the patterns of social classes or strata, the economic system, the legal system, the political system, and the organization and function of religious communities. Sociology seeks to formulate the laws governing the behavior of large numbers of people, and since its inception it has been interested in the general rather than in the specific. Broad generalizations, statistical analyses, and studies of the characteristic similarities and differences in the groups that make up a composite social order are its principal concerns. Sociology informs us with precision that in a given community there are three and a half children per family, but culture still waits for an interview with one of those half children. Sociology is, of all the social sciences, the most closely related to cultural anthropology. Yet the distinction between the two fields continues to be more sharply noted, a fact reflected in the growing number of separations in the academic world of Sociology and Cultural Anthropology into individual departments of study.

Culture is not the same as literature. Both the creation and appreciation of literature rest upon esthetic values which have at their very core patterns of preferment and rejection that are at marked variance with the totality of experience in which culture has its roots. A literary work presents a personal perspective on the predicaments of human life, upon which is superimposed—if it really is literature—a floodlight of intent, effect, and affect that is the very essence of fine art. Some of our most incisive penetrations into the ethos of a given culture come to us through the efforts of the literary artist. Yet in the nature of things, literature can supply us with but a part—though clearly a most valuable part—of what needs to be taught under the heading of culture.

Above all, culture is not the same as civilization. The distinction between these two presents a major problem for teachers and students alike. The word civilization itself, constructed upon the Latin word for the inhabitant of a town or city, is perhaps the best starting point in establishing essential differences. Civilization deals with an advanced state of human society, in which a high level of culture, science, industry, and government has been attained. It deals mainly with cultural refinements and technological inventions that have come about as the result of living in cities and thickly populated areas. Though the effects of civilization may have spread far and wide throughout an entire society, it is fair to say that civilization develops in and emanates from those areas in which persons of diverse classes live together in large numbers, permitting advancements and improvements in all walks of life that are not possible when family groups live in relative isolation. Consider the not unusual circumstance in which two young lovers express their affection for each other over the telephone. The instrument they are using is clearly a device that could have come into being only through the development of civilization. But the attitudes and sentiments the young people express, and the language they use to express them, belong not only to civilization but to culture, for they are events and systems of another order with a very different and far longer history.

Having said with this much emphasis and detail what culture is *not*, it is now time to attempt to say what it *is*. In doing this we do not deny the proximity of all the foregoing areas to the one we shall identify as culture. Nor do we deny the important interrelation of each of them to culture as well as to each other. Indeed, our intention is not to cut off culture from these other matters but rather to focus our perspective in such a way that a foreground is clearly outlined and is sharply contrasted with the background to which it refers and relates.

The most important single criterion in distinguishing culture from geography, history, folklore, sociology, literature, and civilization is the fact that *in culture we never lose sight of the individual.* The geography, for example, of mountains, rivers, lakes, natural resources, rainfall, and temperature is quite impersonal and would be what it is whether people were present or not. It is only when we see human beings in this geographical picture and observe the relationship between their individual lives and these facts and circumstances of the earth's surface that our perspective becomes what we may call cultural. The census, so important in sociology, serves to count people, identify age groups, occupations, and salaries, to quantify types of dwellings and plumbing. But such information does not really become cultural until we see related to it a dark-haired sixteen-year old boy named Henry, tall for his age, who lives in one of these houses, goes to high school, and works part-time at a lunch counter, looks forward to college and a career in electronics, and who writes lyrics for the school paper.

With this criterion in mind, we come to grips with the dilemma of definition. The Humpty Dumpty approach ("When *I* use a word, it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less") must give way to a more normal use of the verbal symbol. It is the fate of some words to have a number of meanings that are not only sharply different but at times contradictory. Such a word is *culture.* We find it used in reference to raising blueberries, improving one's speech, listening to string quartets, and training children in infancy. We find it used to refer to a nation's total character, thought, and action. We call cultural that which stands out as the *best* that people do; we also call cultural *everything* they do, and everything they think and believe as well. Clearly, no single word can mean all these things at once.

When dictionaries list an assortment of meanings for a given word, they assign a number to each one, then define it. We adopt this procedure for the word *culture* in order to separate its various meanings and relate them to each other.

$Culture_1$—biological growth
$Culture_2$—personal refinement
$Culture_3$—literature and the fine arts
$Culture_4$—patterns for living
$Culture_5$—the sum total of a way of life

It is not necessary to say very much about the first three meanings, nor about the last one, for they are all in general use and familiar enough. It is $culture_4$ that is the least well understood, yet the most important in the early phases of language instruction. We define it as follows:

$Culture_4$ refers to the individual's role in the unending kaleidoscope of life situations of every kind and the rules and models for attitude and conduct in them. By reference to these models, every human being, from infancy onward, justifies the world to himself as best he can, associates with those around him, and relates to the social order to which he is attached.

There are certain basic dimensions in the pattern of human existence that are the same everywhere for everyone and always have been ever since man became man. $Culture_4$ deals with man as a human animal as well as with man as man. It must talk about cleanliness and sanitation and the personal needs of food, sleep, and shelter. It must not only answer the question: Where is the bookstore? It must also answer the question: Where is the bathroom? Obtaining food and drink, finding protection against the weather and a place to sleep, communicating with those near us, taking care of the young and the sick or injured, continuing the race, being a child to parents and a parent to children, seeking an outlet for emotional urges and expression of intellectual activities, from idle curiosity to mechanical and artistic invention—all these are the terms according to which human life is lived. They are the constants of the human predicament. Of course they relate to the variable factors of geography, history, economics, civilization, and the others we have named, but these constants are always present for every living human being to deal with no matter how the variables may change, grow stronger or weaker, disappear entirely or dominate completely.

In $culture_4$ interest is centered upon the area where social pattern and individual cón-

form meet and interrelate. (The proposed noun *cónform* comes from the verb confórm, on analogy with cónduct from condúct, cóntrast from contrást, a procedure common in English.) Many factors contribute to shaping the social pattern into what it is, and quite as many contribute to making the individual what he is. What is central in culture$_4$ is the interchange and the reciprocal effect of each upon the other. It is in these terms that we look to history, geography, sociology, linguistics, and psychology for background information that is indispensable. Yet we remember that they are but the casting and the stage setting for the drama of interaction that we call culture.

We reiterate that culture$_4$ focuses upon the individual and the many social circumstances into which he must fit, upon the pattern of accommodation and the personal cónform. What is important in culture$_4$ is what one is "expected" to think, believe, say, do, eat, wear, pay, endure, resent, honor, laugh at, fight for, and worship, in typical life situations, some as dramatic as a wedding or a court trial or a battlefield, others as mundane as the breakfast table or the playground or the assembly line. And just as important is the extent to which that expectation is met. There can be no doubt that throughout life the force and prestige of the cultural model exert a powerful influence upon what the individual thinks and does. But important also, though in inverse ratio, is the effect the individual has upon the model with which he is expected to comply. Small though this influence is, it is the principal origin of social change.

The proper adjustment of individual impulse and action to socially approved behavior is learned in great detail quite early in life, though with little awareness of recommendations to be followed, just as language, with all its complexities, is learned early in life without awareness of rules or formal instruction. Though individual human needs are constant the world over, because men everywhere are physiologically and psychologically the same, there are a thousand reasons why the patterns emerging from the interaction of personal need to group-approved behavior will differ, often very widely, from one locality to another. This is precisely what gives the study of culture its special quality and interest. It is also what makes it indispensable in the learning of another language, for a complete understanding of the new language is possible only in terms of the uniqueness of the patterns for living of those whose language it is.

While man as an animal has certain physiological needs that must be satisfied daily, man as man has certain emotional and spiritual needs that also require daily satisfaction. At all ages, man craves companionship and affection. He needs to satisfy his innate curiosity and to symbolize in various ways. He needs to give expression to the exploratory and creative urges within him. He is never wholly sufficient unto himself, but needs to share his life with others. Culture$_4$ is the area of this sharing process. No individual could create culture by himself; no individual escapes having the imprint of his culture deeply pressed upon him. One of the purest examples of the results of man's association with man is language. Not to recognize language, the simple ability to communicate in words, for the amazing creative process that it is, and to denigrate it instead, is to fail to recognize the very fulcrum upon which all humanism rests.

From the point of view of language instruction, culture$_4$ may upon closer inspection be resolved into two distinct and complementary areas: *formal* culture$_4$ and *deep* culture$_4$. Formal culture$_4$ defines the individual's relationship to the refinement in thought, action, and surroundings of culture$_2$. It defines his relationship to the wide range of esthetic expressions of culture$_3$, poetry and prose, the theatre, painting, the dance, architecture, and artistry in whatever form. It relates him to the displays of heroism and leadership in word and deed that are known to all. It relates him also to the multiple and interrelated structures of social organization, economic effort, and professional discipline, and to the outward manifestations of politics and religion of culture$_5$. The features of formal culture$_4$ are easily discernible in the total pattern of the social group and are actively present in or are accessible to the awareness of the individuals who are in it.

In formal culture$_4$ the social order turns to

the individual, singles him out, and focuses upon him the attention of a small group or large. He is named, orally or in print or both, and comment is made upon his new status, his personal accomplishments. Note is taken of his achievements in the past or his prospects for the future. Such events are infant baptism, birthday celebrations, confirmation ceremonies, the awarding of diplomas and degrees in school and college, the winning of prizes of many sorts, engagement and marriage, appointment and election to rank or office in professional, social, and political organizations, citations for bravery in military life, for accomplishments in civil life and the academic world, and for artistic creations—and finally funerals.

We cannot overlook the negative counterpart of the foregoing, in which the individual is singled out for censure and punishment because of flagrant disregard of what the community expects. A child is punished by being banished from the family table or by being given a place of humiliation and shame in school; an adult, by being expelled from the organization of which he is a member, by fine or imprisonment or even death if his acts are legally reprehensible. In all these instances too, the individual is pointed out, named, and brought to the attention of all concerned.

Deep culture$_4$ functions in a different way. It is a slow, persistent, lifelong process that begins in infancy, and although its effectiveness is most notable in childhood it never really ceases. There is no naming of the individual, no focusing of public attention upon private behavior. Indeed, there is almost no awareness that the process is taking place. But through continued association with others the individual gradually accommodates his way of observing, speaking, eating, dressing, gesturing, thinking, believing, living, and valuing to that of those around him.

There is no reason why the facts of history and geography, the data of economics and sociology, information about and examples drawn from literature and the fine arts should not find their way into the content of language courses to the extent that they do not detract from the principal business at hand: language learning. But until such information has been related to a boy or a girl, a man or a woman with a name, a position in life described, and with a personal interest in and relation to the facts presented, we are not yet within the territory identified as culture$_4$. Whether this person is someone in real life or a character in fiction is not important. What is important is to see an individual relating to the people and the life around him. As long as we provide our students only with the facts of history or geography, economics or sociology, as long as we provide them only with a knowledge of the sophisticated structures of society such as law and medicine, or examples and appreciative comments on artistic creations such as poems, castles, or oil paintings, we have not yet provided them with an intimate view of where life's action is, where the individual and the social order come together, where self meets life.

In retrospect it may seem that our analysis is perhaps too detailed and serves only to complicate an already complex situation even further. But realism suggests that if culture is taken to mean all that is subsumed under the five different definitions, then our task is impossible and we would do better to admit it and abandon the pretense. If, however, culture is taken to mean first of all and principally definition four, with as much of definitions three and five as can reasonably be added as the learner's competence increases, then the task, though still prodigious, at least becomes manageable.

The profile of a culture

In 1953 two anthropologists, Edward T. Hall, Jr., and George L. Trager, issued a prepublication edition of a work entitled *The Analysis of Culture*. The authors were then at the Foreign Service Institute of the Department of State in Washington, D.C. Their purpose was, as scientists, to develop an outline or map according to which any culture could be analyzed and described.

In 1959 one of the authors, Edward T. Hall, published a book entitled *The Silent Language*, which is an amplification of *The Analysis of Culture*. In its simplest form the scheme upon which their presentation is based is a list of ten focal points of critical importance in the fabric of a culture's makeup. These ten points are plotted in two dimensions, horizontal and vertical, yielding a checkerboard or grid with

100 slots or squares, each marking a salient point in cultural analysis. This list is as follows:

1. Interaction
2. Association
3. Subsistence
4. Bi-sexuality
5. Temporality
6. Territoriality
7. Learning
8. Play
9. Defense
10. Exploitation

This is indeed a fascinating list, purporting as it does to mark the principal points in the web of human existence. Under *1. Interaction*, we see man interacting with all that he finds in the environment that surrounds him. Under *2. Association*, we see him associating with his fellows in the family, in study and sports groups, in clubs and guilds, and in many other ways. In *3. Subsistence*, we see him gaining the requirements of living: food, dwellings, clothing. Under *4. Bi-sexuality*, we see the two sexes characterized according to the different things they learn, the occupations they engage in, the lives they lead as men or women, and the ways in which they relate to each other as individuals and as groups. In *5. Temporality*, we consider the time concept and all that this means in the passing of the hours, the cycle of days and nights, of months and seasons, and their effect upon human living. Point *6. Territoriality*, treats of space in terms of a room of one's own, nearness to one's neighbors, the street on which one lives, property of one's own, boundaries, frontiers, and other matters that have to do with space and our relation to it. *7. Learning*, includes what we learn informally and unconsciously (this comprises a large part of our behavior and our thought) as well as what is learned in formal education in childhood and in later life. *8. Play*, is concerned with games, sports, amusements, recreations, and pastimes for all ages. *9. Defense*, deals with our means for defending that which we value and our innate responses that lead us to protect what we consider ours or that which we feel merits our action to defeat aggression. Finally, *10. Exploitation*, studies our control over things, our handling of tools and resources, our development in technology and engineering.

This is a stimulating analysis, and *The Silent Language* can be warmly recommended as useful reading for any language teacher. At the same time, we are likely to feel that this analysis has many of the limitations that characterize a great part of scientific thought in America today. There are many matters that are not brought up for consideration which may appear to those who teach the young equally important in mapping or charting the way of life of a people or a nation. Without denying the value of the ten points listed above, we may propose another list of matters that appear central and critical in the analysis of a culture. Our list is as follows:

1. Symbolism
2. Value
3. Authority
4. Order
5. Ceremony
6. Love
7. Honor
8. Humor
9. Beauty
10. Spirit

An analysis of *Symbolism* would tell us not only about a nation's language but also about its literature and art, its myths, its politics, and its religion. Under *Value* we would consider personal preference and rejection, conscience, morality, and philosophy. Under *Authority* we would note whose word is accepted and acted upon at various ages in one's life and in various situations and circumstances. Under *Order* we would study what dispositions there are toward a clear, methodical, and harmonious arrangement of thoughts and things in the life of both individual and community. *Ceremony* would focus our attention upon the almost excessive human fondness for elaborate dress and complicated ritual, for congregations great and small on occasions gay and solemn. And what analysis of culture would be complete without discussing *Love*, whether it be the attachment of parent and child, of husband and wife, the devotion of one friend to another, or the attitude of an individual toward a supreme being? Even if we see in love no more than the reciprocal of aggression, it would appear to merit a place in our list. Under *Honor* we would consider the high standards of personal conduct

that give evidence of our attitude toward ourselves, our families, our friends, our country. Under *Humor* we would note not only how important and popular is the sense of what is witty, comic, and laughable but also *what* is found to be humorous and how this varies from one age group to another and from one culture to another. Under *Beauty* we would seek for and describe in the products of man's brain and hand that which is over and above the practical and the utilitarian, and marks a striving toward innovation and perfection, and is an indication of the esthetic sense which man is motivated to express. Finally, under *Spirit* our attention would be turned upon the evidence of man's awareness of himself as man, the special human capacity whereby his thoughts may range in time and space far from the situation in which he finds himself, contemplating both reality and non-reality, and permitting him to pursue the eternal quest of what it is that he is.

Culture in the classroom

How can the transition be made from these theoretical matters to the active, crowded, noisy, vital, potentially chaotic, and potentially eager reality that is the classroom?

A class session is a notable example of culture$_4$. Here the forces of formal as well as deep culture are exerted strongly upon the individual. Here he learns for the first time about many of the social models he will eventually face and what his attitude and behavior regarding them is expected to be. There is a prescribed location and décor, a typical atmosphere, a complicated pattern of rapport between peers and persons of unequal station. There is a task at hand to be accomplished together with stated and valued rewards when the pattern and the expected cónform mesh and fit.

It is a special characteristic of the foreign language classroom (when its purpose is to teach communication) that one language is superimposed upon another, producing a result not unlike a double exposure in photography. Ideally the original picture quickly fades as the second picture slowly establishes itself in clarity and detail. Of all the elements of the target culture, the most typical, unique, and challenging, yet the most easily available, is the target language. Its authentic use from the beginning is therefore a most valid cultural objective.

This recommended use of language brings us to an analysis of the classroom as a situation. We ask the usual questions: Where are we? Who is present? What is the interrelationship between one person and another? What are the special features and circumstances of the location? Upon what is attention focused? How is language used and how does it reflect the various factors in the environment? When those present address each other, are the forms used intimate or polite? If proper names are spoken (everyone has at least a half-dozen), which ones are used and by whom? If a name is preceded by a title, what title and which part of the name? What formulas of politeness appear, what requests, what directives? To all these questions neither grammar nor semantics has an answer. They are not matters of language but of language users. As such they are cultural, and rightly observed they can give a cultural dimension to every language class beginning with the first day.

In comparing and contrasting the mother culture with the target culture we may expect to find similarity in the types and range of social models that are to be adjusted to. Differences are less likely to appear in the hierarchy of models than in the details of expectation and the manner of cónform. In this we may see a deeper significance in the establishing of a cultural island in the classroom. Posters, pictures, maps, signs, and realia of many kinds are all helpful. But they remain peripheral to the main features of the situation we are concerned with. What is central is the use of language, the role being played by each of those present, where people stand or sit or how they move about, their attitudes, their gestures, whether the students speak singly or in unison, how permission to speak is asked for and granted, whether replies are memorized or created, how answers are approved of or disapproved of and corrected, what ensues when expected patterns of deportment are not conformed to. The fact that many of these details are different in the target culture gives them an interest and an appeal that easily invites at-

tention and participation on the part of those whose mother tongue is English.

The next important concern is to see how language itself is studied and learned in the target culture, and to imitate or make appropriate adaptations of such procedures in our American classrooms. This concern has to do with the correctness of pronunciation, the rightness of grammatical forms, orthography, and semantic selections. It has to do with all the various skills, particularly of writing, with the role of literary texts in language learning, and with the analysis of language structure. It has to do with the dyadic of language, a behavior pattern which involves far more than question and answer and takes us into the mutual exchange of utterance and rejoinder, which is the commonest form of overt language behavior the world over.

The element of culture that is closest to language, though at bottom non-linguistic, is music. Alike in so many ways, there are basic differences between language and music that result in the listener's always knowing whether the person to whom he is listening is speaking or singing. The reason for this is that vocal music is based upon rigorously enforced patterns of tempo, rhythm, and pitch, all so different that if the message conforms to one it cannot conform to the other. Singing inevitably does violence to the norms of speech in length of sounds, in dynamic stress, and in pitch phonemes. Although music can be of little aid in phonology and syntax, this does not mean that it cannot be moderately helpful in semantics. But the chief value of music lies elsewhere. The non-linguistic characteristics of music are culturally valuable essentially for their orginality and their uniqueness, when they are authentic to the culture in which they developed. Music is welcomed in the language class not because it teaches language but because it represents other elements of culture in a most appealing form.

The human voice and the printed line are not the only vehicles of culture available in the language classroom. The physical menace of a towering mountain, the sound of a waterfall, the three-dimensional facade of a cathedral or a castle, the interior of a powerplant or a capitol building, the taste of a sparkling wine or the odor of a perfume shop cannot be made an immediate experience of the classroom. But pictures can go a long way toward suggesting and acting as surrogate for such details of the target culture. Again, care must be exercised. What is selected for presentation must be authentic, typical, and important; otherwise false impressions may be created. Pictures have been widely used, and rightly so, in presenting culture$_3$. But if pictures are to be effective in culture$_4$ they must in every case relate the cultural configuration to individual participation. It is not enough to see a market display of fruits and fish and vegetables; we need to see the vendor and a client engaged in a transaction. It is not enough to see the facade of a school and some empty classrooms; we need to see a class in session and observe the posture and attitude of teacher and students. It is not enough to see a picture of a busy street scene in a large city; we need to see a closeup of a pedestrian waiting, more or less patiently, for the signal to cross. It is not enough to see a painting displayed in a museum; we would also like to see the artist in his studio working at an unfinished canvas.

Culture$_4$, especially as it is reflected in the use of language, is the dominant feature in the basic course. But as the student advances from one level of language learning to another the nature of instruction in culture changes and develops. In the second phase, culture$_4$ continues to be a principal concern, but the learner now has enough language competence to appreciate comments about and discover and perceive for himself significant matters in culture$_3$ and of course in culture$_5$. As the learner progresses in his reading, he will, if the right things have been done in the basic course, find an added dimension of cultural significance in the stories he reads, in the characters that are depicted, and in the situations that are developed. He will find cultural values reflected in what the author chooses to talk about, to have his characters say and do, to have the reader understand, infer, and react to in his presentation. In this second phase, the learner should begin to understand what is being aimed at in the cultural objective and to see how there can be both a scientific interpretation and a humanistic interpretation of cultural matters.

He should begin to be made aware that he too lives in a culture and that these analyses can appropriately be made of his own way of life as well as of that of a foreign country.

In phase three there can be a systematic study of the target culture along the lines suggested in the section of this paper entitled "The profile of a culture." Literary and non-literary works can be read with both analysis and synthesis in mind, enabling the learner to interweave and interrelate the triple objectives of this phase: the perfecting of the control of language skills, an acquaintance in depth with a significant number of literary works of the highest order, and a sophistication in cultural awareness, insight, and sympathy with regard to the way of life of those whose language he is studying.

Proposals

Proposal I. That the concept of culture as herein defined be reviewed, perfected, and confirmed professionally in a representative and supportive way. That the statement of this concept then be given wide circulation so that it may be made available to teachers in service, teachers in training, authors of materials for classroom instruction, and authors of tests of progress and achievement in language courses.

Proposal II. That materials be prepared to teach students the various meanings of the word *culture* and how they may expect to identify it in the language they learn and the books they read—and how a better understanding of their own culture may result from this study.

Proposal III. That materials be prepared to help teachers know about, analyze, and teach culture in the foreign language in which they are giving instruction.

Proposal IV. That materials be prepared to help teachers give instruction concerning the target culture in English.

Proposal V. That materials be prepared to show how elements of the target culture are embedded in the target language itself.

Proposal VI. That teaching dialogues be prepared that are based not only upon basic matters of linguistic structure and semantics but equally upon situations that are authentic and important in the target culture.

Proposal VII. That the distinction between culture$_4$ and the other meanings of culture be sharpened, and that all areas receive appropriate attention at the proper time and in a suitable way according to the gradually increasing competence of the language learner.

Proposal VIII. That culture be generally recognized as a specific goal from the early phases of language instruction onward, with all that this implies in terms of the preparation of materials, the training and retraining of teachers, classroom procedures, and measurement.

Proposal IX. That increased attention be given to the role of pictures in language instruction, recognizing that while pictures cannot teach the sounds or the structure of a language, they can often show with remarkable success what language stands for. Sharper distinctions are necessary than have been made in the past concerning the power of words to generalize and the power of pictures to particularize.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[A partial listing of books and articles that deal with the problem of teaching culture or are representative of sources from which basic concepts may be derived.]

Barzini, Luigi. *The Italians.* New York: Atheneum, 1964.

Beaujour, Michel, and Jacques Ehrmann. "A Semiotic Approach to Culture." *FLA*, 2(1967):152–163.

Benedick, Ruth. *Patterns of Culture.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1934.

Boas, Franz. *The Mind of Primitive Man.* New York: Crowell-Collier, 1963.

Brooks, Nelson. *Culture and Language Instruction.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1966.

—— "Language and Culture." *Language and Language Learning*, pp. 82–96. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964.

Brown, R. W., et al. "Developing Cultural Understanding Through Foreign Language Study: A Report of the MLA Interdisciplinary Seminar in Language and Culture." *PMLA*, 68 (Dec. 1953): 1196–1218.

Edgerton, M., Jr. "The Study of Languages: A Point of View." *Liberal Education*, 51,iv(1965):1–9.

Fisher, Glen. *Philosophy and Science in Foreign Affairs: The Behavioral Science Component.* A Foreign Service Institute Training Document. Washington, D. C.: Department of State, 1956.

Fleissner, Else M., et al. "Four Cultures." Selective and annotated bibliographies. *PMLA*, 79,iv,part 2(1964):18–49.

Hall, E. T., Jr., and George L. Trager. *The Analysis of Culture.* Washington, D. C.: Pre-publication edition, 1953.

Hall, Edward T. *The Silent Language.* New York: Doubleday, 1959.

Henle, Paul, ed. *Language, Thought, and Culture.* Ann Arbor: U. of Michigan Press, 1958.

Hsu, Francis L. K. *Americans and Chinese: Two Ways of Life.* New York: Schuman, 1953.

Kluckhohn, Clyde. *Mirror for Man.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1949.

Kroeber, A. L. *Anthropology Today.* Chicago: U. of Chicago Press, 1953.

——, and Clyde Kluckhohn. *Culture, a Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions.* New York: Random House, Vintage V-226. (First published by Harvard Univ., 1952.)

Lado, Robert. *Linguistics Across Cultures.* Ann Arbor: U. of Michigan Press, 1957.

Lenneberg, Eric H., ed. *New Directions in the Study of Language.* Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1964.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *The Savage Mind.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1966.

Linton, Ralph. *The Study of Man: An Introduction.* New York: Appleton, 1936.

De Madariaga, Salvador. *Englishmen, Frenchmen, Spaniards.* London: Oxford U. P., 1928.

Mead, Margaret. *And Keep Your Powder Dry.* New York: Morrow, 1942.

——, and Rhoda Métraux. *The Study of Culture at a Distance.* Chicago: U. of Chicago Press, 1953.

Morris, C. *Varieties of Human Value.* Chicago: U. of Chicago Press, 1956.

Murdock, George P., et al. *Outline of Cultural Materials.* New Haven, Conn.: Human Relations Area Files, 1950.

Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. *Culture in Language Learning.* Reports of the Working Committees, 1960. G. Reginald Bishop, Jr., ed. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton U. P., 1960.

Nostrand, H. L. *Background Data for the Teaching of French.* Seattle, Wash.: U. of Washington, 1967.

Opler, M. E. "Themes as Dynamic Forces in Culture." *American Journal of Sociology*, 51(1945): 198–206.

Parsons, Talcott. *Essays in Sociological Theory: Pure and Applied.* New York: The Free Press, 1954.

Sapir, Edward. *Culture, Language, and Personality.* Berkeley: U. of California Press, 1956.

de Tocqueville, Alexis. *Democracy in America.* New York: Knopf, 1946; Vintage Books, 1954. (First published in 1835.)

UNESCO. *Interrelations of Cultures: Their Contributions to International Understanding.* Paris, 1953.

Vygotsky, L. S. *Thought and Language.* Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1962.

Whorf, B. L. *Language, Thought, and Reality.* Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1956.

Wylie, Laurence. *Deux Villages.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.

—— *Village in the Vaucluse.* New York: Harper, 1964.

——, et al. *Six Cultures.* Selective and annotated bibliographies. New York: Modern Language Association, 1961.

Yale French Studies. *Structuralism.* Nos. Thirty-six and Thirty-seven. New Haven, Conn.: Yale French Studies, 1966.

This study was supported in its preparation with MLA/ERIC funds provided by the U. S. Office of Education (NDEA, Title VI).

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.